UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Duty to Civilization (*Part III*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

"If the People Knew": A Comment

By CHARLES THOMAS HALLINAN

India's Saint

By JOSIAH WEDGWOOD

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 11

Chicago, May 12, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER
AND
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 163
Duty to Civilization. Part III.—Francis Neilson 165

THE PULPIT—

Who Is the Greatest Man in the World Today? (*Concluded*).—John Haynes Holmes 169

CORRESPONDENCE—

The League of Nations a Fact.—Henry W. Pinkham . . 172

CONTRIBUTED—

"If the People Knew": A Comment.—Charles Thomas Hallinan 173

SELECTED—

India's Saint.—*Josiah Wedgwood* 174

POETRY—

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, 1921.—James Waldo Fawcett 163
Anticipation.—*Dombey* 172

THE FIELD—

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom . . 175

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1921 NUMBER 11

JENKIN LLOYD JONES, 1921.

(Lines for Louis Betts' Portrait.)

Say not this gentle teacher has left us and passed on,
For we know his spirit rises with the coming of each dawn.
The majesty and glory of his deed will never die,
And his memory will freshen as the marching years go by.
The temple that he visioned will yet be builded tall,
And the brotherhood he prophesied will answer to his call.
For tomorrow is tomorrow, and our fate is what we will;
We shall see the promised Eden from the crest of yonder hill.
Onward then, and onward, where he leads the eager van,
For the love, the pride, the mercy and the fellowship of Man!

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

The Knox Resolution and Senator Lodge's promise of a separate peace with Germany mark the definite end of the Versailles Treaty and the League Covenant, so far at least as the United States is concerned. They are the last shovelfuls of earth cast upon the grave of these "Siamese twins" documents. All that we have been contending for since the abominations of the Peace Conference were announced to the world in 1919, is now accomplished. Our country will be no partner in what *The Freeman* well calls the "League to Enforce Ruin." In this moment of triumph, however, it is well to be candid with ourselves, and thus remember two things. In the first place, the forces which have been working for the ratification of the Treaty and the acceptance of the Covenant, have represented in large part the idealism of the nation. They have been grossly deceived as to the real character of Treaty and Covenant, accepting as a half-loaf what is not bread at all, but a stone; but they have been moved by high desires for international peace and amity, and have been sincerely seeking the great end of a justly ordered world. On the other hand, the men who have defeated the work of Woodrow Wilson at Paris, have been dominated by the lowest motives of political intrigue and selfish nationalism. With the exception of a few leaders of the Knox and Borah type, these men have understood nothing of the case presented by the liberals and radicals. They have sought not a happier and securer world, but a safer and fatter America! It is not surprising that the present hour of triumph should be accompanied by a reaction in Washington against disarmament, and all that makes for peace! In such circumstances, the next step on the part of all idealists, pro-Leaguers and anti-Leaguers alike, is to combine in support of a new program of constructive international organization. By-gones must be by-gones, and all hands joined in persuading the administration to summon a new conference for the healing of the nations.

We wonder how many Americans are finding any satisfaction in the foreign policy of the administration. Haggling and blustering with Japan over the preposterous island of Yap—serving notice on Europe that we propose to enjoy all our rights as a belligerent in the Treaty of Versailles, while incidentally declining to assume any of the responsibilities—throwing down the gauntlet of defiance on the Monroe Doctrine—boasting of our ability and determination to "beat the world" in armament construction—what kind of policy is this for times like these? We had thought that Germany had done all the sabre-clashing that was necessary for one generation; but lo and behold, here we are stepping right into the role of Germany, as though nothing had been learned at all from the downfall of the Kaiser! From our standpoint, the right policy of the United States at this critical juncture in human affairs, is obvious. It is "not to think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think." It is to be quick in appreciation of our duties rather than of our rights. It is to speak words of gentleness and goodwill. It is to lead in works of healing and reconciliation. It is to dare great hazards, and set high examples, to the end of peace. It is to remember that for a nation as well as for an individual man, it is true that "if any would be first among you, let him be the servant of all." President Harding does not seem to be a man of the swashbuckler type. In his personal relations he is wholly amiable and right-minded. Why should he not find it possible to treat the nations with whom he has official dealings, exactly as he would treat a neighbor in the town of Marion?

It is the Governor of Georgia who tells us that the condition of the Negro in his state is so bad that, if allowed to continue, "both God and man would justly condemn Georgia more severly than God and man have condemned Belgium and Leopold for the Congo atrocities." In his statement the Governor cites 135 instances of

> "Negroes lynched, Negroes held in peonage, Negroes driven out, by organized lawlessness, and Negroes subjected to individual acts of cruelty," within the past two years. "In some counties," he says, "the Negro is being driven out as though he were a wild beast; in others he is being held a slave; in others no Negroes remain."

All this is no news to those who have studied con-

ditions in the South in recent years. But it *is* news, of the first order of importance, that such facts should be proclaimed and denounced by a Governor of Georgia! Unless we are wholly misinformed, this is the first time that such an official has spoken out on behalf of justice for the black man. In itself, this marks almost a new era in the history of the Negro problem. It will mark without question a new era, if this action of the Governor is sustained by public sentiment, and induces effective legislation. It is doubt on this question which justifies for the present an attitude of "watchful waiting." Let us see what Georgia does with this Governor and his testimony. Will he be treated as men are usually treated who "break ranks" in their own class, and tell the truth? Or will his fellow-citizens rally to him as one who seeks bravely to rescue an oppressed race from bondage, and the South itself from shame? Upon the answer to these questions hangs much!

Max Eastman, in the current issue of *The Liberator,* makes plain that he does not believe in free speech. He concedes that he has been denied the exercise of free speech by the powers-that-be in society, and asserts stoutly that he would himself deny this right to his enemies, if he had the requisite authority. "Only one thing would please me better," he says, "than to suppress the *Tribune* (N. Y.), if I had the power, and that would be to suppress the *Times.*" In all this we believe friend Max to be totally and shamefully wrong. His attitude illustrates what we regard as one of the most serious menaces of the time—namely, the disappearance from the radical mind of all standards of morality and idealism. The new movement of reform among us has adopted the extreme Jesuitical position that anything is right which will serve the advancement of your cause. The post-war radical is ready to practice all the tyrannies and outrages of the foe he fights, if only he can get the upper hand. All this we believe to be as disgraceful as it is dangerous. It is the wanton betrayal of the little that is precious and beautiful still left us in the world. Furthermore, we count such an attitude as fatal to the very cause of economic emancipation which Eastman has at heart. It is terribly bad tactics! For the world is never going to be persuaded by advocates who begin by throwing overboard every last one of those ideals of freedom and morality which have been achieved at such a cost. Nor, if force is the decisive factor, is it going to allow itself to be overthrown by those who are thus minded. Robert Dell puts the matter effectively when he says that "if the proletariat is merely going to exchange one form of . . . slavery for another, it is hardly worth while to have the trouble and inconvenience of a revolution." We will endure present tyrannies, thank you, rather than flee to other tyrannies that we know not of. Max Eastman has paid the price of loyalty to freedom, and he should not thus wantonly betray her at this hour.

Another illustration of the moral breakdown of radicalism in our time is given by the flight of "Big Bill" Haywood to Moscow. We fail utterly to see how there can be any two sides in this case! Haywood has broken his word to his bondsman. He has betrayed those who followed his leadership and trusted his example. He has arrogated to himself, as a strong and able man, a privilege of freedom which was never offered and could not therefore be enjoyed by those weak, obscure and unknown I. W. W.'s who now carry the cross without his aid. He has done his utmost to break down the merciful custom of the bail system; many a poor devil, for many a day to come, will rot in jail awaiting trial, because bail cannot be had in the light of "Big Bill's" flight. Decency, honor, comradeship, all thrown to the winds, just because, as we have heard it argued, "Haywood can be of more use in Moscow than in Fort Leavenworth." Even if this practical consideration were sound, it would not excuse the indecent and cruel offense committed. But it is not sound—Haywood is *not* of more use in Moscow than in Fort Leavenworth. Debs in Atlanta, like Christ in Calvary, is the irrefutable answer to that plea!

Our old friend, Pussyfoot Johnson, has returned to England to renew in that country his great campaign against the liquor traffic. It is evident from his statements that he expects to make real progress in the furtherance of the cause, although it still seems inconceivable to the man who knows England and its deep-rooted alcoholic prejudices and customs, that prohibition can be established there in any brief period of time. The sudden success of the prohibition movement in America, however, proves that anything is possible in this field. In confirmation of this fact, comes news from Italy—of all places in the world!—that the cause of prohibition is there making rapid strides. "Economic conditions," says Prof. David Levi-Morenos, an agricultural expert, "are impelling the nation toward restrictions on intoxicants." Restrictions do not take us very far; but even to think of restrictions in Italy seems like seeing ice in the tropics. And once restrictions are established, the rest is comparatively easy! We are convinced that the prohibition movement is destined to sweep the world from end to end. Alcoholism, like human sacrifice, will soon be a thing of the past.

France is invading Germany, and thus renewing the war of 1914; England is convulsed by a vast coal

strike; Ireland is aflame from end to end with revolution; industry steadily declines, and starvation and misery spread rapidly and surely among the helpless millions of Europe; bankruptcy still impends, and civilization hangs upon the edge of collapse and dissolution. Never was there such a crisis in human affairs! But we are not without expectation of relief. For behold, a series of ten lectures is announced in Boston, by ten well-known clergymen, on the subject, "Why I am What I am, a Protestant." Rev. Isaac Ward begins the series with a talk on "Why I am a Presbyterian Christian or Scottish Churchman." Dr. James A. Verberg follows with an address on "Why I am a Dutch Reform Churchman." Dr. Frederick Palladino tells "Why I am a Methodist and not a Churchman of Rome." Then comes the climax in an address by Dr. A. J. Hughes on *"Why I am an Immersionist and Not a Sprinkler."* Here is Christianity rising to the challenge of the hour! How can we be concerned about the world when the church thus sees its duty, and does it bravely? In the face of such a spectacle, is it not amazing that, after nearly two thousand years of teaching, mankind has not learned the gospel of the Nazarene?

Duty to Civilization

III.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot's article on the probable causes of the European War, written for the *New York Times* and reproduced in the *London Chronicle,* was the only pronouncement from an American that British radicals found worthy of consideration. He summed up the matter in these words:

> "When one begins to reflect on the probable causes of the sudden lapse of the most civilized parts of Europe into worse than primitive savagery, he comes at once on two old and widespread evils in Europe from which America has been exempt for at least 150 years. The first is secret diplomacy with power to make issues and determine events, and the second is autocratic national executives who can swing the whole physical force of the nation to this side or that without consulting the people or their representatives. Some of the underlying causes of the horrible catastrophe the American people are now watching from afar are commercial and economic. One of the most interesting and far-reaching effects of the present outbreak of savagery is likely to be the conviction it carries to the minds of thinking people that the whole process of competitive armaments, the enlistment of the entire male population in national armies, and the incessant planning of campaigns against neighbors, is not a trustworthy method for preserving peace. It now appears that the military preparations of the last fifty years in Europe have resulted in the most terrific war of all time, and that a fierce ultimate outbreak is the only probable result of the system."

Dr. Eliot sized up the situation without the inside knowledge of secret diplomacy British radicals had gathered over a period of ten years. Mr. Theodore Roosevelt was, perhaps, the only other distinguished American who, in the early weeks of the war, seemed to be conscious of the dangers of the European system. He said:

> "I am not passing judgment on Germany's action. . . . I admire and respect the German people. I am proud of the German blood in my veins. When a nation feels that the issue of a contest in which, from whatever reason, it finds itself engaged will be national life or death, it is inevitable that it should act so as to save itself from death and to perpetuate its life. . . . What has been done in Belgium has been done in accordance with what the Germans unquestionably sincerely believed to be the course of conduct necessitated by Germany's struggle for life."

With little or no knowledge of the European System, the vast majority of the American people remained neutral, and indeed the press generally seemed to favor a policy of open-minded inquiry. In looking over the press reports and editorials published in the early weeks of the war, I find them singlarly fair to both groups of belligerents.

What then brought about the great change of front as to the cause of the war? Some people say the atrocity stories, others say the sinking of the Lusitania. No one has, however, presumed to give a good reason why anyone should change his opinions about the origin of the war because of anything that happened after it began. I lost a sister on the Lusitania, but the bereavement did not in any way change my opinion as to the origin of the war. The real fact of the matter seems to me to be this: that it was neither the story of atrocity in itself, nor the horror of the sinking of the Lusitania in itself, that brought about the extraordinary change of mind in the American people. It was something more potent because it was so subtle, and that was the many-sided work of the war-propagandists, the constant hammering day in and day out on one point—the alleged guilt of Germany for planning the war, beginning the war, and fighting it with every barbarous device. This was the method by which the Americans permitted themselves to be deluded. Knowing a good deal of the inside of the business of setting up an official propaganda department, knowing the men who organized it, and knowing the class of person that was called upon to do the work of "conversion," I feel sure every intelligent American who was caught in this snare would hang his head in shame, if he really knew

the methods that were put into practice to hide the truth from him.

Consider the case of the whitewashing of Sir Edward Grey. In December, 1905, Grey consented to the secret conversations between the French and British Military and Naval Staffs. The nature of these conversations has been fully dealt with by Fisher, French, Haldane and others.

In connection with these conversations, the French and British Staffs entered into a pact without official sanction with the Belgian Staff for action (official sanction in secret diplomacy not being necessary). That Belgium was engaged with Britain and France notwithstanding the denials of Sir Edward Grey and Lord Haldane, is now accepted as a fact. Marshal Joffre himself, on the witness stand before the Metallurgic Committee in Paris, 1919, confessed as much. Yet both Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith said, in the House of Commons, several times before the war began, that Great Britain was under no obligation to send an Expeditionary Force to the Continent and that Great Britain had no secret naval alliance with Russia.

If it were only for the purpose of revealing to the people one of the most pernicious aspects of the European system, that of the military and naval staffs entering into negotiations with one another without official sanction, and the danger lying in this procedure to the peace of the world, it would be important for all folk who desire to bring about a better state of affairs to enter heart and soul into this task. Now that the secret documents of Russia and Belgium have been published, and the story of the secret military and naval preparations of Great Britain and France have been dealt with in the works of so many Admirals and Generals, there is not the slightest excuse for anyone being ignorant of the terrible work carried on under the cloak of secret diplomacy. The fact that the peoples' representatives can be lied to by Cabinet ministers should be enough to convince anybody of the necessity of exposing the system.

Lord Loreburn, who was Lord Chancellor in the Cabinet of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, has flatly repudiated the assumption that Grey and Haldane consulted the Prime Minister in 1906 about the secret conversations. One has only to examine the statements of Sir Edward Grey and Lord Haldane to see how contradictory they are. In his statement to the House of Commons, August 3rd, 1914, Sir Edward Grey said that he was approached by the French Government in January, 1906. Lord Haldane in his book also says that it was in January, 1906, when the British General Staff consulted with the French Military Attaché, Colonel Huguet. It is now known pretty generally that negotiations between the British and French military authorities had been in progress for some time before 1906, and that a pact had been made by the leaders of the opposition party. Indeed, it was the uncompromising attitude of the new Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, on the question of the reduction of armaments, that forced the British militarists of both parties to enter secretly into negotiations with Colonel Huguet. It was December 26th when Mr. Balfour, replying to Sir Henry's statement on the reduction of the expenditure on armaments, said:

> "I noticed with amazement that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, at the Albert Hall, in the speech to which I have just referred, announced to his audience that he meant to cut down the cost, and as I understood him, with the cost the number and magnitude of the defensive forces of the Crown Army and Navy, as the case may be. I wonder whether he consulted the present Secretary of State for War (Haldane) before giving that pledge. I doubt whether he did. . . . His pledge to reduce the cost of our armaments and the magnitude of our armaments is a pledge not given with knowledge, nor given after study, not given in consequence of our Imperial responsibilities."

What else can this mean than that Grey and Haldane took over the treaty obligations of the outgoing Ministry without acquainting their chief of the nature and scope of the military and naval commitments? Let us consider two of the many versions now published of what took place. Haldane, in his book, "Before the War," says:

> "Sir Edward Grey consulted the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Asquith and myself as War Minister, and I was instructed, in January, 1906, a month after assuming office, to take the examination of the question in hand. This occurred in the middle of the General Election which was then in progress. I went at once to London and summoned the heads of the British General Staff and saw the French Military Attaché, Colonel Huguet."

This must refer to January 12th, when Grey and Haldane together were at Berwick, on the Scottish border. Neither the Prime Minister nor Mr. Asquith was in the neighborhood of Berwick that day, and it should be noted that Haldane went to London to see the military authorities, not the Prime Minister.

Colonel Repington's version, in his work, "The First World War," is quite different. He says:

> "Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Haldane had news of what was going on, and determined to meet in spite of their electioneering. They did so, at the greatest personal inconvenience," (they were within thirty miles of each other on January 10th)

"and to their everlasting credit agreed to take upon themselves the responsibility for continuing the conversation in a semi-official manner. They met at Berwick."

"Mr. Haldane then came on to London to see Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman during the week-end of Sunday, January 14th. He obtained the new Prime Minister's approval and then gave Sir Neville Lyttleton and General Grierson permission to carry on."

This is very strange, for Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman spoke at Meigle on the borders of Perthshire and Forfarshire in Scotland on Saturday, January 13th, and at Glasgow on Monday, January 15th. Haldane was with Grey at Berwick on January 12th, and Grey spoke at Bamburgh, January 13th. Why the Prime Minister should take a journey that week end, occupying at least sixteen hours, to meet Haldane in London, when they were quite near each other in Scotland, is a mystery. An easy motor car ride on the 11th or 12th would have taken the Prime Minister, Grey, Asquith and Haldane to a center in Scotland where they could have held a meeting.

Was Campbell-Bannerman consulted? On December 30th, 1905, Repington saw Admiral Fisher, who told him:

"That he (Fisher) had seen on paper Lord Lansdowne's assurances to M. Cambon, and that they were quite distinct in their tenor. He (Fisher) had shown them to Sir Edward Grey, and declared that they were part of the engagements taken over from the last Government, and would hold good until denounced."

That must have been on or about December 11th, when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman announced the completion of his cabinet. Meanwhile, Colonel Repington and Colonel Huguet discussed the situation, and Repington "communicated the purport of the conversation on the morning of the 29th, by express letter to Sir Edward Grey," who was at his country residence, Fallodon, Northumberland. It is pretty clear from Repington's story that neither Grey nor Haldane consulted the Prime Minister, for Repington says:

"On Monday, January 1st, 1906, came Sir Edward Grey's reply from Fallodon, dated December 30th. He said: 'I am interested to hear of your conversation with the French Military Attaché. I can only say that I have not receded from anything which Lord Lansdowne said to the French, and I have no hesitation in affirming it.'"

The Prime Minister had not, according to the versions of Haldane and Grey, been consulted in December, 1905. In Repington's version of what took place Cambon saw Grey on January 10th:

"M. Cambon had then suggested official intercommunications by the respective staffs, but Sir E. Grey had said that they were impracticable at present, and that we must wait until the elections were over and the Government installed. M. Cambon had judged that Grey was privy to the private and unofficial conversations in progress."

This statement points clearly to the negotiations having taken place before Christmas, 1905, and that Haldane, who was the Minister for War, could not have informed his chief of what had taken place. Lord Loreburn has said that Sir Edward Grey's statement to the House of Commons, August 3rd, 1914, "was the first recorded communication pointing to our making war on behalf of France if she should come to blows with Germany." Then he adds:

"The thing of which Sir Edward Grey made light proved to be the parting of the ways in our relations with France. Enmity had already given place to good will, but we had not yet espoused the quarrel of France or held out the prospect of fighting by her side. In the beginning of 1906 her statesmen learned that even this was possible. This concealment from the cabinet was protractive and must have been deliberate. Parliament knew nothing of it until August 3rd, 1914, nor anything of the change of policy which the suppressed communications denoted."

How complete the plans were can be understood by a perusal of Lord French's work, "1914." French says:

"The British and French general staffs had for some years been in close secret consultation with one another on this subject. The German menace necessitated some preliminary understanding in the event of a sudden attack. The area of concentration for the British forces had been fixed on the left flank of the French, and the actual detraining stations of the various units were all laid down in terrain lying between Maubeuge and La Cateau. The headquarters of the army were fixed at the latter place. In the ten years previous to the war I had constantly envisaged the probable course of events leading up to the outbreak of this world war, as well as the manner of the outbreak itself. Lord Haldane was himself alive to the possibility of war; but, while he hoped to ward it off by diplomacy and negotiation, he fully acquiesced in the desirability of making every preparation which could be carried out in complete secrecy. He told me that were he in power, if and when the event occurred, he would designate me to command the Expeditionary Force, and requested me to study the problem carefully and do all I could to be ready. It thus fell out that in August, 1914, the many

possibilities and alternatives of action were quite familiar to my mind. It is not within the knowledge of all that the general staffs of Great Britain and France had, for a long time, held conferences, and that a complete mutual understanding as to combined action in certain eventualities existed."

Dr. Eliot was perfectly right when he named secret diplomacy and the process of competitive armaments as "the probable causes of the sudden lapse of the most civilized parts of Europe into worse than primitive savagery."

The question whether it is wise for a people to permit secret negotiations of this kind deserves more consideration than it has received from American leaders of thought since the Armistice. Somehow it seems to have dropped out of discussion altogether. If it were but for the purpose of proving how utterly unreliable military and naval experts are in making preparation for action, it would be worth while Americans taking up this question. Consider the preposterous ideas held by the European military and naval staffs. Colonel Repington has told us "It was supposed by certain soldiers that the war against Germany would be decided by the fighting of some seven great battles *en rase campagne* where heavies would be a positive encumbrance." Then, from so great an authority as Lord Esher, of the Committee of Imperial Defense, we learn that the war was to be over in from three to nine months. In August, 1915, he wrote to the *Glasgow Herald* as follows:

"From the outset of the war I have been thrown into the company of practically every one of our leading statesmen, and I have found them all wrong in their forecasts without exception. They genuinely believed in a short war. They prophesied its conclusion in anything from three to nine months. They jeered at a less optimistic view, and hardly one of them but held that before now (August, 1915) the British Army, accompanied by political plenipotentiaries, would be marching through Berlin."

The war had not been in progress a month when I was told by a personage high in authority that the Russian steam-roller would be at work in Berlin before Christmas. Perhaps no war ever began with staffs so sanguine of victory in a short time as this one; and if long and careful preparation for war can be accepted as an indication of success, the Allied staffs had good reason to expect a speedy triumph. The organizer of victory, Lord Haldane, says:

"During the whole of the period between the commencement of 1906 and the autumn of 1914, I sat on the Committee of Imperial Defense and took an active part in its deliberations. For over six of these eight years I was Minister for War, and I was in continuous co-operation with the colleagues who were, like myself, engaged in carrying into execution the methods which we had gradually worked out. Such as the plans were, the preparations which they required were completed before the war."

"We knew how high a level of military organization had been attained in France. She had a large army, an army not so large as that of Germany, but comparable with it in quality. Her ally, Russia, also had a large army on the other side of Germany, although one not so perfectly organized as that of France. By adding to the French military defensive forces a comparatively small British Expeditionary Force of very high quality, organized as far as possible on the principle about which von der Goltz in the introduction of his famous book, 'The Nation in Arms,' had written, we could provide what that eminent writer had suggested would be formidable, could it be properly organized, even against the German masses of troops."

"A careful study had made us think that the addition of even a small force of such quality to those of France and Russia would provide the combined armies with a good chance of defeating any German attempt at the invasion and dismemberment of France."

Nowhere does Lord Haldane say that the British authorities considered that they owed a duty to civilization in making their preparations for the overthrow of German arms. On the contrary, he gloried in the work of making the British Expeditionary Force, in combination with the armies of France, Russia, and Belgium, a fighting machine which would surpass anything Germany might raise. He did not hesitate to go to German military authorities for his inspiration. He had undertaken the job a few days after he became Minister for War in December, 1905, and left no stone unturned in the work of surmounting the difficulties of the business. He knew the secret provisions of the Franco-Russian alliance. And he admits that Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey were fully informed of every step that was taken by his Department. So complete indeed were the arrangements made by Lord Haldane and his French and Russian colleagues that he is moved to go into the minutest detail of the work of preparation:

"I should like to say how much the Committee of Imperial Defense, which was originally a very valuable contribution made by Mr. Balfour, when Prime Minister, to the organization of our preparedness for war, owed to its secretaries. To such men as Admiral Sir Charles Ottley and, after his time, to Colonel Sir Maurice Hankey, the nation is under a great debt, and it was the

least that could be done to include the latter in the thanks of Parliament to the sailors and soldiers to whom our actual success was due. It was he who, assisted by a brilliant staff on which the late Colonel Grant Duff was prominent, planned and prepared that remarkable War Book, which was completed in excellent time before the outbreak of hostilities, and which contained full instructions for every department of Government which could be called on to assist if war broke out. Not only the drafts of the necessary orders, but those of the necessary telegrams, were written out in advance under Sir Maurice Hankey's instructions. He and Sir Charles Ottley, themselves sailors, formed real links between the navy and army, and did an enormous amount of work in co-ordinating war objectives."

So much for the nonsense written and spoken by war-propagandists about the Allies being caught unprepared and that Germany was wholly responsible for the war.

Sir Edward Grey told the House of Commons on August 3rd, 1914, that he agreed to the proposals of the military and naval experts and authorized the conversations to take place, "but on the distinct understanding that nothing which passed between military and naval experts should bind either Government or restrict in any way their freedom to make a decision as to whether or not they would give that support when the time arose." What that statement was worth can be guessed by considering the work of preparation revealed by Lords Haldane and French, the two men at the head of affairs. Some years before the outbreak of the war, Lord Haldane had dubbed the Foreign Secretary "Commander of the Forces," and at that time he told the country that "strategy depends on policy, the policy of the Foreign Office." So sure was Haldane of the military and naval position when he returned from Berlin after his famous mission, that, at a meeting in London, he exclaimed: "At no distant time we ought to be the most powerful military and naval nation combined which the world has ever seen."

The coating of whitewash given to Sir Edward Grey by war-propagandists cracked a long time ago, and the last brushful of it peeled off when French published his work, "1914." The best that can be said of him is that he struggled mightily, when the crisis came in the last week of July, 1914, to wriggle out of the position in which his diplomacy had placed him. There is no doubt that he suffered keenly in those terrible days, but he had no one to blame but himself for the policy of secret diplomacy he pursued from the time he took office under Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in 1905. FRANCIS NEILSON.

(To be continued.)

THE PULPIT

Who Is the Greatest Man in the World Today?

A Sermon by John Haynes Holmes, Community Church of New York

(*Concluded*).

I believe that there is—unquestionably the greatest man living in the world today, and one of the greatest men who has ever lived. I heard of him first in 1917, through an article by Professor Gilbert Murray in the *Hibbert Journal*. I did not learn anything of him again until a few months ago, when there came to my desk a little paper-covered pamphlet containing extracts from his speeches and writings. This is meagre information; but when I read it, I felt as did John Keats when he first read Chapman's translation of the *Iliad*—

> Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
> When a new planet swims into his ken;
> Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
> He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
> Looked at each other with a mild surmise—
> Silent, upon a peak in Darien.

The man whom I have in mind is Mohandar Karamchand Gandhi, the Indian, leader of the present great revolutionary movement against British rule in India, known and reverenced by his contrymen as Mahatma, "the Saint." I wonder how many of you have ever heard of him, or know the story of his life. Listen while I tell this story, and see if I am not right in calling its hero the greatest man in the world today!

Gandhi was born some fifty odd years ago in India, of a rich, clever and cultivated family. He was reared as the sons of such families are always reared, possessed of everything that money can buy and the imagination of devoted parents can conceive. In 1889, he went to England to study law. He took his degree in regular course, returned to India, and became a successful lawyer in Bombay. Already, however, he had found that religion was coming to have a dominant place within his life. Even before his journey to England, he had taken the Jain vow to abstain from wine, flesh, and sexual intercourse. On his return to India, his asceticism increased. Finding that money was inconsistent with his ideal of spirituality, he gave away his fortune to good causes, keeping only the barest pittance for himself. Later on, he took the vow of poverty, and thus became what he is still today, a beggar. Later still he became converted to the doctrine of non-resistance, which he calls "the root of Hinduism," and therefore abandoned the practise of the law as "a system which tried to do right by violence." When Gilbert Murray saw him in England in 1914, he ate only rice, drank only water, and slept on the bare boards of a wooden floor. "His conversation," says Professor Murray, "was that of a cultivated and well-read man, with a certain indefinable suggestion of saintliness." Gandhi had indeed become a saint. He had deliberately swept out of his life every last vestige of self-indulgence, that no slightest desire of the flesh might stand in the way of devotion to his ideals. From early in his life he was a man apart, with every last energy of soul and body dedicated to the service of humankind.

His public career divides itself into two distinct periods. The first extends from 1893 to 1913, and

is identified with South Africa. The second, which belongs to India itself, runs from 1913 to the present day.

In South Africa, in the early nineties of the last century, there were located some 150,000 Indians, chiefly in the province of Natal. The presence of these aliens had led to a situation very similar to that now prevailing in California as a result of the influx of the Japanese. The color question, in other words, had become acute, and the South African government determined to meet it, first by forbidding the immigration of any more natives from India, and secondly by expelling the Indians who were already there. This last, it was found, could not legally be done; it violated a treaty, was opposed by Natal where industry was dependent upon cheap "coolie" labor, and was objected to by the Indian Government. The first proposal, of course, could easily be met by the passage of an exclusion act. At once began a long and bitter struggle. The whites of South Africa, baffled in their desires, did what the whites in all parts of the world have always done under such circumstances —namely, persecuted and outraged those whom they detested as so-called inferiors. Systematically they undertook to make life in South Africa as miserable an affair for all Indians, especially those above the labor class, as malice and cruelty could provide. Thus, these Indians were burdened with special taxes; they were forced to register in degrading ways; their thumb-prints were taken as though they were criminals; they were publicly insulted and discriminated against. In cases where the law could not be conveniently utilized, the South African whites did what we do so proudly here in America—organized patriotic mobs, to loot, burn and lynch. Nothing was left undone to harry these unhappy Indians, and drive them in wretchedness and horror from the land.

It was in 1893, that the Indians in South Africa appealed to Gandhi, and asked him to come and help them. At once he responded to their call, for it was his conviction that, if his countrymen were anywhere suffering, it was his duty and privilege alike to suffer with them. He went, therefore, to Natal in 1893, and there he remained, with the exception of one short interval of time, until 1913. As he was still a lawyer at this time, he began his fight against the Asiatic Exclusion Act, and won it, in the face of the most bitter and unfair opposition, on grounds of constitutionality. Then came the terrific battle for equitable political and social recognition—a struggle fought from beginning to end with the weapons of passive or non-resistance. Not once in all the years of the protracted struggle, was there resort to violence, or yielding to the temptation of retaliation and revenge.

Acting as the leader and counsellor of his people, Gandhi founded a settlement in the open country, just outside the city of Durban. Here he gathered the Indians, placed them on the land for self-support, and bound them by the solemn vow of poverty. Here for years these organized thousands of resisters, suffering constant deprivation and frequent outrage, carried on their struggle against the government. It was in essence, I suppose, a strike—a withdrawal of the Indians from labor in the towns and villages, and a paralysis, therefore, of the industrial and social life of the republic. It was such a strike as Moses declared in ancient Egypt, when he led the Israelites out of the land of Pharaoh into the vast reaches of the wilderness. But this strike, if it may so be called, was in one thing different from any previous strike in human history! Universally in movements of this kind, the resisters make it their business to take quick and sharp advantage of any difficulty into which their opponents may fall, and press their claim the harder for this advantage. Gandhi, however, took the opposite course. Whenever, in these years of struggle, the Government became embarrassed by unexpected troubles, Gandhi, instead of pushing the fight ruthlessly to victory, would call a truce and come to the succor of his enemy. In 1899, for instance, the Boer War broke out. Gandhi immediately called off his strike, and organized an Indian Red Cross unit, which served throughout the war, was twice mentioned in dispatches, and was publicly thanked for bravery under fire. In 1904, there came a visitation of the plague in Johannesburg. Instantly, the strike was "off," and Gandhi was busying himself in organizing a hospital in the pest-ridden city. In 1906, there was a native rebellion in Natal. Again the strike was suspended, while Gandhi raised and personally led a corps of stretcher-bearers, whose work was dangerous and painful. On this occasion he was publicly thanked by the Governor of Natal —and shortly afterwards, on the resumption of the resistant movement, thrown into a common jail in Johannesburg! It would be impossible for me to tell the indignities and cruelties which were visited upon Gandhi during these years of intermittent resistance and forgiveness. He was thrown into prison countless times, placed in solitary confinement, lashed hand and foot to the bars of his cage. He was again and again set upon by raging mobs, beaten into insensibility, and left for dead by the side of the road. When not outraged in this fashion, he was insulted in public, mortified and humiliated with the most exquisite pains. But nothing shook his courage, disturbed his equanimity; exhaused his patience, or poisoned his love and forgiveness of his foes. And at last, after twenty years of trial and suffering, he won the victory. In 1913, the Indian case was taken up by Lord Hardinge, an imperial commission reported in Gandhi's favor on nearly all the points at issue, and an act was passed giving official recognition to his claims. I know of no more astonishing illustration of a battle won by doing no wrong, committing no violence, but simply enduring without resentment all the punishment the enemy can inflict, until at last he becomes weary and ashamed of punishment!

The second period of Gandhi's life began in 1913, and is at this moment in the full tide of its career. This period, of course, has to do with the great revolutionary movement in India, which had been slowly developing during his years of absence in South Africa. Immediately upon his return, he took the leadership of this movement; but in 1914, with the outbreak of the war with Germany, suspended all operations against English rule. To strike at England at such a moment, he contended, was to strike her in the back; and it was as reprehensible to strike a nation in this cowardly fashion, as to strike a man. Throughout the war, therefore, Gandhi gave enthu-

siastic support to the Empire in every way not inconsistent with his religious ideals.

Immediately that the war was closed, however, quickened by the outrages visited upon the Indians during this period by the oppression of English tyranny, Gandhi lifted again his banner of revolt, and organized that stupendous non-co-operative movement which is shaking the British Empire at this moment to its foundations. What we have here, under Gandhi's leadership, is a revolution—but a revolution different from any other of which history has knowledge. It is characterized by four distinctive features.

In the first place, it is a movement directed straight and hard against English rule in India. There is no concealment of Gandhi's determination to free his people from the injustice and cruelty implicit in alien domination. "So long," he says, "as the Government spells injustice, it may regard me as its enemy, implacable enemy." Again, he declares, "I seek to paralyze this Government. Until we have wrung justice from unwilling hands, that is what I stand for." Still again he asserts, "I deliberately oppose the Government to the extent of trying to put its very existence in jeopardy." That this is sedition, Gandhi sees as clearly as any one. If he were charged under the sedition section of the Indian Penal Code, he says that he "could not plead 'not guilty,' . . . For my speeches are intended to create disaffection such that the people might consider it a shame to assist or co-operate with a Government that had forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support."

With all this unbending opposition to English rule, however, there is mingled no hatred against the English people. Gandhi has never at any time been guilty of the sin to which most of us were tempted during the war with Germany, of confusing a government with its people. "I tell the British people," says Gandhi, "that I love them, and that I want their association"; but this must be on conditions not inconsistent with "self-respect and . . . absolute equality."

Secondly, Gandhi's movement is a revolution which has no place for force or violence of any kind. "Non-violence" is its most conspicuous motto and slogan. For Gandhi, as we have seen, is a non-resistant; and in India as in South Africa, will win his victory by peaceful means, or not at all! "Violence," he says, "whatever end it may serve in Europe, will never serve us in India." We must fight our battles with cleaner weapons, on a nobler plane of combat. Thus, "we (must) meet their ungodliness by godliness. We (must) meet their untruth by truth; we (must) meet their cunning and their craft by openness and simplicity; we (must) meet their terrorism and frightfulness by bravery and patient suffering." Further, he says, "We must bring no violence against those who do not join our ranks"—how well were it, if Lenin practised this rule of conduct! And he adjures his followers to hold "every English life, and the life of every officer serving the Government, as sacred as those of our own dear ones"—think of what it would mean to Ireland if Sinn Fein observed this precept! "As soon as India," says Gandhi, "accepts the doctrine of the sword, my life as an Indian is finished. . . . Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart."

In advocating thus the policy of non-violence, Gandhi takes pains to emphasize that he is not doing this because the Indians are weak. On the contrary, he commends non-violence just because India is so strong and thus so well able to meet the hazards involved. "I believe in the doctrine of non-violence," says Gandhi, "as a weapon not of the weak but of the strong. I believe that man is the strongest soldier who dies unarmed with his breast bare before the enemy." Again, he says, ". . . I want India to practice non-violence because of her strength and power. No arms are required for her. We seem to need it because we seem to think that we are but a lump of flesh. I want India to recognize that she has a soul that cannot perish, and that can rise triumphant above every physical weakness and defy the physical combination of the world."

At bottom, of course, Gandhi advocates and practises non-resistance because he thinks it right. "The true thing," he declares, "for any human being on earth, is not justice based on violence but justice based on sacrifice of self." Again he says, "Non-violence is noble and right. . . . Forgiveness is more manly than punishment. Forgiveness adorns a soldier." It is from this point of view, I take it, that Gandhi refers to his movement as "this religious battle!" He is insistent, however, that non-resistance is not only right but expedient. It is the one sure way of attaining a triumph that will endure. "The condition of success," he says, "is to ensure entire absence of violence." Again, "India might resort to destruction of life and property, but it could serve no purpose. You need but the one weapon of suffering." Such truth is obvious to any one, says Gandhi, who understands the laws of a universe which is spiritual. "If we would realize the secret of this peaceful and infallible doctrine, we will know and find that we will not want to use even an angry word when they lift the sword, we will not want even to lift a little finger."

Non-violence, however, is not enough. Non-resistance means something more than mere acquiescence in suffering. It must have a positive or aggressive policy—and it is this which Gandhi provides in what he calls "non-co-operation." To all his followers, Gandhi recommends refusal to co-operate in any of the political or social functions which are essential to the continuance of British rule in India. He urges that the Indians boycott everything English, and thus paralyze the whole English system of control. Thus, he advises that his countrymen refuse to sit on the local Councils; that native lawyers refuse to practise in the courts; that parents withdraw their children from the schools; that titleholders give up their titles. On the occasion of the recent tour of the Prince of Wales, he urged all Indians to refuse welcome or recognition to the royal visitor. Even a boycott of English goods is under consideration, but of this Gandhi voices his disapproval. Such policy, of course, if effectively carried out on a large scale, would destroy English rule in India; it would little by little bring paralysis to the government as the hemlock brought inch by inch the chill of death to the limbs of Socrates. "The peacefullest revolution the world has ever seen" would be triumphant.

Lastly, as the crown of his great movement, Gandhi seeks the moral and spiritual regeneration of India on the lines of Indian thought, Indian custom, and Indian idealism. This means the exclusion, so

far as possible of the influence of the west, with its industrial slavery, its materialism, its money-worship and its wars. The first step in his endeavor, is to wipe out the barriers which divide the Indians from one another, and make them one great united brotherhood. Thus, he seeks the obliteration of caste distinction and religious differences; Mohammedan must live peaceably with Hindu, and Hindu with Mohammedan. Then must come a leadership of mankind in ways of peace and amity. "I believe absolutely," says Gandhi, "that India has a mission for the world." His idealism, therefore, transcends the boundaries of race and country, and seeks to make itself one with the highest hopes of humanity. "My religion," he cries, "has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself."

Such is Mahatma Gandhi! In this great spirit, he lives among the people. As he moves from city to city, crowds of thirty and even fifty thousand people assemble to hear his words. As he pauses for the night in a village, or in the open country-side, great throngs come to him as to a holy shrine. He would seem to be what the Indians regard him—the perfect and universal man. In his personal character, he is simple and undefiled. In his political endeavors, he is as stern a realist as Lenin, working steadfastly toward a far goal of liberation which must be won. At the same time, however, is he an idealist, like Romain Rolland, living ever in the pure radiance of the spirit. When I think of Rolland, as I have said, I think of Tolstoi. When I think of Lenin, I think of Napoleon. But when I think of Gandhi, I think of Jesus Christ. He lives his life; he speaks his word; he suffers, strives and will some day nobly die, for his kingdom upon earth.

Do you recall how it is told of Jesus, that one day, as he was journeying, he heard his disciples quarrelling? And he said, "What were ye reasoning on the way?" And they said they had disputed, who was the greatest. And Jesus said, "If any man would be first among you, let him be the servant of all."

ANTICIPATION.

Heaven were to me a place where I may be
That which I am, in frank simplicity,
Freed from pretense and fashion's crude deceits;
And where, with growing vision, I may see
The beckoning form of what I hope to be.

The Song of Life and Other Poems. —*Dombey.*

Men tell me that God is to be worshipped in houses made with hands, but the trees point me to the open sky. Men say that God is a god of vengeance, but if that is true the roses and lilies bear false witness. Men tell me that God loves the righteous and hates sinners, but the sunshine refutes their statement. Men tell me that salvation can be attained in a day, but an oak that has been saving its soul for several centuries speaks more convincingly than they. Men tell me that God made His world, then rested, but my garden declares that He is still working. Men say that earth is a vale of tears, but a warbler under my window tells me they lie!—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

The Christian Century.

CORRESPONDENCE

The League of Nations a Fact

To the Editor of UNITY:

I protested against the scheme of the League to Enforce Peace, which was embodied essentially in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Consistently I condemned that Covenant upon its publication. I was surprised when all the European nations that had had sense enough to keep neutral during the war—the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Holland and Spain—became members of the League. That fact compelled a reconsideration of the League on my part. Now that forty-eight nations are members, that the Assembly has met, that the Council has had several meetings, that the Secretariat is functioning, the time has passed for judgment of the Covenant as an abstract project. The League is a fact, a great and significant, a potent and vital fact in the world today. It is, undeniably, a going concern. What Mr. Lansing thought of the plan on paper two years ago has but little relevance to the present situation.

It has become quite clear and certain, in my opinion, that those parts of the Covenant to which I especially objected will be a dead letter from the outset. I refer to the undertaking to use coercion upon a nation in certain contingencies. *Each nation is to judge for itself whether the specified contingency has appeared or not.* There is no supernational authority to decide the question. Such is the accepted interpretation today of the Covenant, as was shown in the discussions of the Assembly. But that interpretation virtually nullifies the so-called sanctions of the Covenant. There will never be a universal boycott of a nation, for it is inconceivable that all the other nations will agree that a boycott is deserved or desirable. The Council will never recommend military action against any nation, for it is inconceivable that a body representing such various and world-apart interests could agree to such a recommendation. The sanctions of the Covenant are therefore so nearly impossible of execution, according to the conditions specified, as to be safely ignored pending the time when they may be explicitly eliminated, like a vermiform appendix though not so dangerous.

Apart from its provisions for the coercion of nations, the Covenant is good, a step in that organization of the world which is long overdue. Let our great country take its place in the present League of Nations to make that League as soon as possible world-embracing, a "parliament of man, the federation of the world."

I cannot honestly confess that I have been "bamboozled" concerning the League, nor can I surrender my present view as a "ridiculous obsession." My difficulty may not be due to a lack of "decency" on my part as you generously intimate. Perhaps I need to be shown.

Brookline, Mass. HENRY W. PINKHAM.

. . . Words are fools
Who follow blindly, once they get a lead.
But thoughts are kingfishers that haunt the pools
Of quiet; seldom seen; and all you need
Is just that flash of joy above your dream.

—*Siegfried Sassoon.*

CONTRIBUTED

"If the People Knew": A Comment

I have read with deep interest Miss Wentworth's article in UNITY for March 31 in which she develops, with woman's direct logic, the implications of Lord Robert Cecil's suggestion, the idea that wars are the creations of governments and not of peoples. For the first time in my life I have spent a winter in an alien land and I have had it borne in upon me, also for the first time, that possibly our theory needs substantial modification, but the mutual irritations of peoples are a larger factor than Miss Wentworth's theory would allow.

Here I am, an American, living in London. What do I find? I find that my people are profoundly unpopular with the plain people over here. The government has nothing to do with it, at the present stage; in fact, the government seems to be doing all it can to allay the feeling. But you can scarcely pick up a newspaper—I am a voracious reader of newspapers, especially the bad ones—without finding the word "American" used as the synonym for everything that is pushing, and crude, and vulgarly rich. Nobody wants a *war* with America, unless perhaps Mr. Horatio Bottomley, the editor of the jingoistic *John Bull,* but what people do want, seemingly, is to discharge in the air, so to speak, their dislike of America and Americans. People reveal it with an unconsciousness that staggers you as when a man says to you, with an air of great breadth and liberality: "As for *me,* I like the Americans myself!"

Ordinarily you meet with perfect courtesy, though nothing like the warm hospitality which an Englishman would get in America. But now and then you bump into an experience which reveals a lot. I am a haunter of bookstores. I went into one the other day and began looking over the new books when the manager came up to me. "I take it you are an American," he said. I looked up, amused that my appearance should thus have given me away, and nodded. "I thought so," he said, and then he added in a dull, stolid voice: "One of the bookstores here has put up a sign in the window, 'No American trade wanted,' because," he went on to explain, "the Americans come in and look around and never buy." I stared at him in amazement. But there was no mistaking the significance; he simply didn't want me in the store; the shopkeeper was completely submerged in the irritable citizen. Flushed and dazed, I looked around for the door and as I went out I found myself saying through my teeth: "You may fire, Mr. Gridley, when you are ready!"

I stood in a bar room—I am telling you a lot of low stories, I am afraid—and listened with painful interest to a conversation between an Englishman who had just returned from "the states" and the tall and buxom barmaid. "They are a nation of secret drinkers," said the barmaid, "that's wot they are. A nation of sneaks, I call 'em!" "Sneaks is right," said the Englishman. "And what they won't do for the dollar isn't worth doing." "You know it," said the barmaid, "and Pussyfoot comin' over here. Why does the American think he can run the world; will you tell me that?" "It's their national vanity," said the Englishman. "They are the vainest people in the world." "I expect you're right," said the barmaid.

I came over here believing that the Irish question would be solved over night if the government did the decent thing, but I am pessimistic about it now. Scattered thickly through every English community are individuals who have accumulated a violent anti-Irish "complex." They believe the most preposterous stories about the Irish; they retail them with gusto; and they will vote with passion against any government which dares to let the Irish lift their heads. On the boat coming over some charming English middle-class folks sat at my table. The conversation turned on Ireland. I want to tell you that I never heard such malignancy, such hatred, as those middle-class English showed toward Dublin. I stood it as long as I could; then I left the table. . . .

I have tried at various times to set down, for my own consideration, the factors that make America unpopular over here. Certainly "Pussyfoot" Johnson is one of them. The Englishman would never dream of trying to modify American institutions and he simply cannot understand the non-conformist zeal we display in upsetting one of his. Our lynchings stamp us, in the English consciousness, as a barbarous people. The atrocious sentences which our magistrates mete out shock the English profoundly. Not long ago the newspapers here carried prominently a dispatch from New York about a magistrate who had given a poor wretch a sentence of fifty-nine years. That made England shiver from Land's End to John o' Groat. It disgusts them; they don't want anything whatever to do with a people so callous, so different. That noon I went to a club for luncheon, a club frequented by "liberals" and "intellectuals." As I passed through the dining room, winding in and out between the crowded tables, I overheard someone say: "Oh, yes, he is an American," and another voice murmured something ". . . fifty-nine years! . . .

These things do not fit smoothly into the classic theory of pacifism. They represent the friction of peoples, of conflicting national traits, of different traditions. "Democratic diplomacy" is not enough so long as democratic bad manners persist. I sometimes think that "Pussyfoot" Johnson is a bigger menace to the peace of the two countries than the American oil interests; he "riles" more Englishmen daily, hourly, than our State Department trying to be firm over Mesopotamia. Since the armistice England has repeatedly yielded ground to France—substantial ground, too, as on the coal question—but there is nothing like the popular irritation against France that there is against America. During the war we poured a million unsophisticated boys through London. These boys saw for the first time the diminutive English locomotive, the diminutive "goods" train, and they let out one million roars of laughter. The English didn't like it; it has left a bad taste. More English people have commented to me on the bacon we sold them during the war than on the lives we placed at their disposal. You see how it is, petty, painful, irregular, defying the easy classifications. . . .

In its simplicity, the theory implies that the various peoples live in their respective vacuums, minding their own business, while the governments run amuck. It isn't as simple as that any more; it is somehow more difficult. . . .

CHARLES THOMAS HALLINAN.
Redcliffe Square, London.

SELECTED

India's Saint

India is drifting into anarchy. To understand what is now happening in India one must first understand Mahatma Gandhi, and then the state of the clay which he is moulding. The saint or Mahatma has India at his feet; the *intelligentsia* differs from him in private, rarely in public; property differs from him and trembles; the Government, any Government, differs from him (because he goes to the root of all Government), and thinks it best to—wait.

The last time I saw him he was sitting cross-legged on a mattress on the floor, eating a dish of rice, and surrounded by a semi-circle of squatting disciples. All he wore was his small white convict cap and a pair of coarse white trousers. "Why have you not brought Mrs. Wedgwood?" said he. On the whole, I was glad I had not, for I know few things more unpleasant than being perched up on a chair, in boots, when all around are silent strangers on the floor.

Gandhi specializes in giving up, in reducing his wants; his recreation is fasting, and making his disciples fast. He looks so physically frail and weak and small that one could carry him as one does a child, and he makes one feel like that towards him. He is as serious as any child, and as pure. All this has captured India. One does not feel it blasphemous to compare him with Christ; and Christ, too, one suspects, gave infinite trouble to reasonable and respectable followers. For Gandhi is a philosophic anarchist—a new edition of Tolstoy, without Tolstoy's past, and a Tolstoy who has long since subdued Nature and shrunk into simplicity.

He tells me that when first he came to London he took lessons in dancing and elocution to fit himself for the polite world. But he is a Jain, peculiarly averse to taking life, and, while still a child, he had already found the efficacy of non-resistance; he now came upon Ruskin's "Unto this Last," and the dancing lessons ceased. A loathing of civilization, especially Western civilization, grew up. He read Tolstoy's "The Kingdom of Heaven is Within You," and it fitted in. In South Africa, in the early years of the century, he was still nominally a lawyer, but the practice died out, and instead the gaols of the Transvaal and Natal began to be full of his disciples. The last cure for oppression by Government is to be completely indifferent to whatever Government may do. Non-recognition of law, non-co-operation with the State which is the embodiment of civilization, was born in South Africa. It is a terrible weapon, but it can be used only by those who are prepared to lose all. That is a condition which is just beginning to be understood by Indian Nationalists, and they are beginning to shy. It does not deflect the Mahatma. Three times he was gaoled; once he was left for dead, murdered by his own followers for imagined treachery.

In South Africa, too, he wrote his first book, "Indian Home Rule," and sketched the same scheme. If you would destroy English rule, you must go to the root—cease to use the schools and law courts, refuse to plead, go to gaol gladly. "The Western civilization has corrupted you. Cast it out—by non-co-operation." But he is not so much interested in destroying Western rule as Western civilization, Western wants, and the parasitic work of towns. Such cotton clothes as he has are hand-spun, hand-woven, and hand-made. His food (when not fasting) is too simple to create fear of gaol fare. (Only, he does use a high-powered motor and the railway train [third class] and the Philistines jeer!)

All this shows why he has such a hold on India, the land of resignation, and also why the fear of him grows too. He takes the students away from the colleges without asking the parents' leave, saying, "Follow me." Education may be a universal need, but educationalists are a Western product, and they squirm. Pundit Maleviya will even fight for his child, the Benares University. Parliaments and Councils are the machinery of Western government. "Do not join them!" and the Indian politicians, exasperated by Punjab Martial Law, give up them, too, and hand the Councils over to the Moderates. They do not like it, but they obey. I fear he tolerates Democracy as little as Autocracy on account of their last two syllables. Only he cannot get the lawyers to leave their practices or officials to leave their posts. Only—Gandhi himself is not mighty enough to destroy Western civilization, even by precept and practice, or by his hold on the masses—masses crying, "Mahatma Gandhi ki jai"—"to Gandhi the victory," though that victory lead them they know not where. Gandhi alone is not enough to drive India to anarchy. There are his allies, the Moslem fanatics; and there is the Government, which, for fear of prestige, dare not apologize.

The Saint's allies are not of his own sort. Shankat Ali is his stable companion, and Shankat Ali, once a cricketer and now a fanatic, stands seven feet high and five feet broad, in a great green cloak and a high, white astrachan cap. Shankat Ali is a likable, big, bluff, hearty man, when you meet him; but his ideas of the virtues of passive resistance are hardly skin deep. He works up the Moslem "Ulemas" and "Peers," and procures "fetwas," and gets the whole of religious fanaticism boiling. He calls the mixed crowd "brothers," but the only brothers he recognizes are brothers in the faith. The Sultan of Rampur (his native State) has taken from him his family, his goods, and home. He has lost all except his sixteenth-century faith. "Tell the Government that I am too fat to run," he says to those who warn him of imminent arrest.

A revision of the Sèvres Treaty will hardly appease Shankat Ali. For him the British are kafirs for whom there is no place in India. And the strength of the non-co-operation movement is among the Moslems. It is the Moslem colleges that the students have deserted or captured. It is the Moslem seats on the Council that find no electors or candidates. It is the recalcitrant Moslems who feel the first and full weight of the social boycott. The Hindoos, writhing under memories of Martial Law, understand neither the man nor the cause, and are a little nervous of the whirlwind; while Shankat and his brother, Mahomed, would even stop cow-killing to cement the alliance and remove the rule of those who have trampled on the Khalifa and on the people of God.

The clay in the hands of these men is India.

The Nation, London. —*Josiah Wedgwood.*

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

Formerly

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PERMANENT PEACE

Object: To organize support for the resolutions passed at the Women's International Congress at The Hague in 1915 and in Zurich in 1919, and to support movements to further Peace, Internationalism and the Freedom of Women.

President, Jane Addams, U. S. A.; Vice-Presidents: L. G. Heymann, Germany; H. M. Swanwick, England; Secretary-Treasurer, Emily Balch, U. S. A.; Assistant Secretaries: C. Ramondt, Holland; Marguerite Gobat, Switzerland.

The Third International Congress will be held in Vienna, Austria, July 10-16, 1921.

As the first Congress, held at The Hague in the midst of war in 1915, by fifteen hundred women representing twelve nations, gathered into a well-considered program the propositions then being discussed in every neutral and belligerent country looking towards permanent peace:

As the Second Congress, held in Switzerland in 1919, by women representing twenty-one nations, formulated a protest against the unworkable terms of the treaty, and urged a consideration by the League of Nations of those human interests which have hitherto been so inarticulate in international affairs:

So the Third Congress, to be held in Vienna in 1921, by women representing a still larger number of nations, may, it is hoped, draw together the movements for reconciliation, the demands for a new method of approach and for a constructive good will, all of which are so sadly needed in the relationship between nations.

—The mornings of the Vienna Congress will be given to plenary sessions, the afternoons to committee meetings and private informal discussion. There will be public meetings of general interest in the evenings. The New Women's Club of Vienna, the Municipality and other corporations, are heartily co-operating with the plans for the Congress. The Agenda of the Congress is not yet arranged, but it is hoped to cover such topics as the following: Education as the Way to Peace; Efforts Against War Animosities; Women in International Affairs; Pacifism in Moments of Economic and Social Transition; Revision of Treaties; The League of Nations; Freedom of Trade, Transit and Communication; The Organization and Work of the W. I. L. P. F.

All the well established National Sections have already selected their twenty delegates and ten alternates. Miss Balch, the International Secretary, is at present traveling in the Balkans in the interests of some of the newer organizations. The United States Section is arranging for delegates at large from Mexico, Japan and China.

International Summer School for Men and Women of All Nationalities

At Salzburg, an ancient town of great historic interest and picturesque site, long a famous center for artists and tourists, within easy reach of the Bavarian Alps and the Tyrol.

This school, held under the auspices of The Women's International League, is in charge of the British Section. They have recently published the following announcement:

"A programme for the Summer School with list of speakers is now nearly completed. Among others we have secured Professor G. F. Nicolai, Author of 'The Biology of War'; Dr. Lionel Taylor M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., University Extension Lecturer, London; Dr. Ethel Williams; Mr. Watkin Davies, History Lecturer at Bristol University; Mr. Hermann Tobler, Director of the New School, Switzerland; Prof. Schulze Gaevernitz, and Monsieur F. Crucy on 'The Contemporary Press.' Mlle. Rolland will give the French Literature classes. We hope shortly to get out a final programme.

"Will any members who are not able to go themselves, but would like to help poorer students, particularly from Central Europe, to attend, please send us any, even the smallest, donation towards this purpose."

Hotel accommodations can be secured for from $12 to $15 per week. Inexpensive meals will be served at the Government Restaurant, to which Hoover food drafts for the use of the School are being sent.

Date—August 1-15, 1921.

Place—The Mozarteum, Salzburg, Austria.

Subject—"Education for Internationalism."

For further information apply to Miss Margaret B. Crook, 125 East 37th St., New York; or to Miss K. E. Royds, 14 Bedford Row, London, W.C.I.

The Chairman of the Austrian Section writes: "There is now in Vienna no lack of food supplies, but only an immense lack of money to buy food supplies imported at the high rates of exchange, and for foreigners this does not count. Even the mark stands so high that at present a mark brings 10 crowns, so that the German women can live here for one-tenth of their money. But that nobody may be able to say that bread, the most important article of food, has been eaten away from the Viennese by international guests, the local Committee of Arrangements will open a special bakery for members of the Congress, with bread baked wholly from American flour procured at the cost of the Congress members." Each delegate is sending $10 in advance for this purpose.

The following twenty delegates and ten alternates were elected at the annual meeting of the United States Section, April 9 to 11, 1921, held in New York City. These delegates will represent the United States Section of The Women's International League at the Vienna Conference. We have reason to believe that members and friends of the League from many countries, in addition to those elected as delegates, will be present in Vienna at the time of the conference. All International members are entitled to the privileges of the floor and are urged to attend.

CONNECTICUT

Miss Mary Hurlbut, Mrs. T. H. Fain.

ILLINOIS

Dr. Alice Hamilton, Mrs. Esther Kohn, Miss Dorothy North, Miss Editha Phelps, Miss Lydia Schmidt, Miss Mary Rozet Smith.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. David Cheever, Miss Rose Standish Nichols.

NEW JERSEY

Mrs. C. Laddey, Mrs. John Rettinger.

NEW YORK

Miss M. T. Burritt, Miss Madeline Doty, Miss Elsa Guertler, Mrs. Florence Kelley, Miss Mabel H. Kittredge, Mrs. J. C. Merriman, Mrs. James Warbasse, Miss Carolena Wood.

PENNSYLVANIA

Miss Sophia H. Dulles, Miss Mary Ingham, Mrs. J. Reece Lewis, Mrs. Wilfred Lewis, Miss Ella Riegal, Miss Sanford, Miss Ellen Winsor.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Abbey Scott Baker, Mrs. Harriet Connor Brown, Mrs. Mary Church Terell.

Mrs. Henry Villard, Fraternal Delegate Women's Peace Society.

Mrs. J. C. Merriman of the Commodore Hotel, New York City, will be glad to give information and assistance concerning reservations on steamers sailing from New York in time to reach Vienna by July 10th.

THE WAYS OF THE GODS

By ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

(International Press, 150 Lafayette Street, New York)

Is attracting wide and favorable notice. The New York *Herald* speaks of it as "an historical and sociological study vast in range and original in conception." The *Evening Post* says, "it is simply and intelligibly written." The Chicago *Herald-Examiner* calls it a "Flaming Book."

"The Ways of the Gods" is passing to its second printing.

BAKER AND TAYLOR COMPANY

Trade Selling Agents

354 Fourth Avenue **New York**

Price $3.00. 400 pages with list of authorities and index.
Bound in blue and silver gray. *To read it is an education.*

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -